IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

ROXANNE ARI,

No. C 18-4437 WHA (PR)

Petitioner,

ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE: GRANTING LEAVE TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS; DENYING

APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL

v.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

(Dkt. Nos. 2, 5, 6)

WARDEN,

Respondent.

INTRODUCTION

Petitioner, a California prisoner, filed this pro se petition for a writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2254 challenging her conviction in state court. For the reasons discussed below, respondent is ordered to show cause why the petition should not be granted.

STATEMENT

Petitioner was convicted in Contra Costa County Superior Court in 1991 of seconddegree murder. She was initially found not guilty by reason of insanity, then when adjudged sane, she stood trial and pled guilty. She was sentenced to a term of 19 years to life in state prison. She challenged her conviction in a habeas petition in the California Supreme Court, which was denied in 2017.

ANALYSIS

STANDARD OF REVIEW A.

This court may entertain a petition for writ of habeas corpus "in behalf of a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court only on the ground that he is in custody in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States." 28 U.S.C. 2254(a); Rose

v. Hodges, 423 U.S. 19, 21 (1975). Habeas corpus petitions must meet heightened pleading requirements. McFarland v. Scott, 512 U.S. 849, 856 (1994). An application for a federal writ of habeas corpus filed by a prisoner who is in state custody pursuant to a judgment of a state court must "specify all the grounds for relief which are available to the petitioner ... and shall set forth in summary form the facts supporting each of the grounds thus specified." Rule 2(c) of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, 28 U.S.C. foll. 2254. "[N]otice' pleading is not sufficient, for the petition is expected to state facts that point to a 'real possibility of constitutional error." Rule 4 Advisory Committee Notes (quoting Aubut v. Maine, 431 F.2d 688, 689 (1st Cir. 1970)).

B. LEGAL CLAIMS

Petitioner claims: (1) that her conviction violates the Double Jeopardy Clause; (2) that her right to due process was violated; (3) that she received ineffective assistance of counsel; and (4) "widespread criminal conspiracy and corruption." The fourth claim does not raise cognizable grounds for federal habeas relief because no constitutional right or other federal law is invoked. The first three claims are cognizable, however, and warrant a response.

CONCLUSION

- 1. The clerk shall mail a copy of this order and the petition with all attachments to the respondent and the respondent's attorney, the Attorney General of the State of California. The clerk shall also serve a copy of this order on the petitioner.
- 2. Respondent shall file with the court and serve on petitioner, within **sixty-three** (63) **days** of the issuance of this order, an answer conforming in all respects to Rule 5 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases, showing cause why a writ of habeas corpus should not be granted based on the claims found cognizable herein. Respondent shall file with the answer and serve on petitioner a copy of all portions of the state prison disciplinary proceedings that are relevant to a determination of the issues presented by the petition.

If petitioner wishes to respond to the answer, she shall do so by filing a traverse with the court and serving it on respondent within **twenty-eight days** of the date the answer is filed.

3. Respondent may file, within sixty-three (63) days, a motion to dismiss on procedural

grounds in lieu of an answer, as set forth in the Advisory Committee Notes to Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases. If respondent files such a motion, petitioner shall file with the court and serve on respondent an opposition or statement of non-opposition within twenty-eight days of the date the motion is filed, and respondent shall file with the court and serve on petitioner a reply within **fourteen days** of the date any opposition is filed.

- 4. Petitioner is reminded that all communications with the court must be served on respondent by mailing a true copy of the document to respondent's counsel. Petitioner must keep the court informed of any change of address and must comply with the court's orders in a timely fashion. Failure to do so may result in the dismissal of this action for failure to prosecute pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(b).
- 5. Leave to proceed in forma pauperis is **GRANTED**. The motion for appointment of counsel is **DENIED**. Counsel will be appointed at a later date if an evidentiary hearing or other circumstance necessitates such appointment.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October <u>16</u>, 2018.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE